



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,259	12/11/2001	Steven C. Deane	GB 000179	2761

24737 7590 04/29/2003

PHILIPS ELECTRONICS NORTH AMERICAN CORP
580 WHITE PLAINS RD
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591

EXAMINER

LANDAU, MATTHEW C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2815	

DATE MAILED: 04/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/014,259	DEANE, STEVEN C.
	Examiner Matthew Landau	Art Unit 2815

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12 and 13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election with traverse of Group I in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that Applicant's amendment has eliminated the reason for insisting upon restriction. This is not found persuasive because claims 12 and 13 still contain the subject matter necessitating the restriction requirement. However, since claim 11 is no longer patentably distinct from claim 1, it will be considered a linking claim.

Claims 1 and 11 link(s) inventions I and II. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 1 and 11. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable.

In re Ziegler, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 12 and 13 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 4.

Drawings

Figures 1 and 2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-5 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In regards to claim 1, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the same side" and "the

other sides"

In regards to claims 2 and 3, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the array area".

In regards to claims 4 and 5, there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the profile".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker et al. (US Pat. 6,275,277, hereinafter Walker) in view of Greene et al. (US Pat. 6,496,238, hereinafter Greene).

In regards to claim 1 and 9, Figure 2 of Walker discloses a supporting plate 115, an array of control elements (column 5, lines 3-15), wherein the profile of the plate is non-rectangular. A difference between Walker and the claimed invention is a set of row address conductors on the plate for addressing the array to which selection signals are applied by a row driver circuit, a set of column address conductors on the plate to which data signals are applied by a column driver circuit for conduction to the array. This arrangement of row and column address conductors is extremely common in the art. A further difference between Walker and the claimed invention is connection from the respective driver circuits to at least some of both sets of address conductors is via the same side of the array. Figure 9c of Greene discloses a set of row address conductors 200 for addressing the array to which selection signals are applied by a row driver circuit, a set of column address conductors 182 on the plate to which data signals are applied by a column driver circuit for conduction to the array, wherein connection from the respective driver circuits to at least some of both sets of address conductors is via the same side of the array. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walker by using the array configuration of Greene. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Walker in the manner described above for the purpose of fabricating a display with small outlines (see abstract).

In regards to claim 2, a further difference between Walker and the claimed invention is connection from the row driver circuit to the row address conductors is via respective connectors

which are substantially parallel to the column address conductors within the array area. Figures 9c and 9k of Greene disclose a connection arrangement wherein connectors from the row driver circuit to the row address conductors 200 are substantially parallel to the column address conductors 182 within the array (column 9, lines 30-45). In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to further modify the invention of Walker by using the connection arrangement of Greene for the purpose of reducing the capacitive coupling between the conductors.

In regards to claim 3, a further difference between Walker and the claimed invention is connection from the column driver circuit to the column address conductors is via respective connectors which are substantially parallel to the row address conductors within the array area. Figures 9c and 9k of Greene disclose a connection arrangement wherein connectors from the column driver circuit to the column address conductors 182 are substantially parallel to the row address conductors 200 within the array (column 9, lines 30-45). In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to further modify the invention of Walker by using the connection arrangement of Greene for the purpose of reducing the capacitive coupling between the conductors.

In regards to claims 4 and 5, Figure 2 of Walker discloses the profile of the plate is substantially symmetrical about perpendicular axes.

In regards to claim 6, Figure 2 of Walker discloses the array is non-rectangular.

In regards to claims 7 and 8, Figure 2 of Walker discloses the array is substantially symmetrical about perpendicular axes.

In regards to claim 10, Walker discloses the display is reflective (column 5, lines 3-10).

In regards to claim 11, Figure 2 of Walker discloses a method of constructing an active matrix device comprising a supporting plate 115, an array of control elements (column 5, lines 3-15), wherein the profile of the plate is non-rectangular. A difference between Walker and the claimed invention is a set of row address conductors on the plate for addressing the array to which selection signals are applied by a row driver circuit, a set of column address conductors on the plate to which data signals are applied by a column driver circuit for conduction to the array. This arrangement of row and column address conductors is extremely common in the art. A further difference between Walker and the claimed invention is connection from the respective driver circuits to at least some of both sets of address conductors is via the same side of the array. Figure 9c of Greene discloses a set of row address conductors 200 for addressing the array to which selection signals are applied by a row driver circuit, a set of column address conductors 182 on the plate to which data signals are applied by a column driver circuit for conduction to the array, wherein connection from the respective driver circuits to at least some of both sets of address conductors is via the same side of the array. In view of such teaching, it would have been obvious to the ordinary artisan at the time the invention was made to modify the invention of Walker by using the array configuration of Greene. The ordinary artisan would have been motivated to modify Walker in the manner described above for the purpose of fabricating a display with small outlines (see abstract).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kunio discloses a LCD with a non-rectangular support plate. Burrell et al. discloses a display device with single-sided driver connection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew C. Landau whose telephone number is (703) 305-4396.

The examiner can normally be reached from 8:00 AM-4:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (703) 308-1690. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7722 for regular communications and (703) 308-7722 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Matthew C. Landau

Examiner

EDDIE LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

April 27, 2003